UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,888	09/20/2000	Chris Connaughton	INXT 1021-2	6813

22470	7590	07/12/2006

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
P O BOX 366
HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019

EXAMINER
SAIN, GAUTAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/665,888	CONNAUGHTON, CHRIS
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gautam Sain	2176	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 April 2006</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-60</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>34-60</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1)   This is a Nonfinal rejection in response to response filed on 4/24/2006.

2)   The filing date is 9/20/1999, to Assignee Intelliseek (at the time of filing the

invention).

3)   Claims 1-33 were previously cancelled. Claims 34-60 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4)   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4-1)   Claims 34-36, 38-41, 43-45, 47-50, 52-54 and 56-59 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Baisley</u> (US 6502112, filed Aug 27, 1999),

in view of <u>Aoyama</u> et al (US 6098071, filed Jun 7, 1999).

Regarding claims 34, 43 and 52, Baisley teaches parsing the first and second

documents into a first and second plurality of groups of characters delineated by block

level markup language tags and executing a routine to match groups in the first plurality

of groups with corresponding groups in the second plurality of groups, and to identify

differences between said groups in the first plurality of groups and matching groups in

the second plurality of groups. For example, Baisley discloses a method for comparing

XML documents for identical contents, where a first XML document is parsed to create

a graph of it's objects where each object is assigned a unique identification and a

second XML document is parsed by a parser to create a graph of its objects where each

object is assigned a unique ID. The compare module then compares the documents

and provides an output signifying that the documents are equal or unequal (see col 4,

lines 46-63). The two documents are compared to see fit hey are semantically identical,

that is, there is a one to one correspondence between the objects in the two documents

(col 5, lines 10-17).

Baisley does not teach, but Aoyama teaches composing a difference document

comprising a third plurality of groups that include identified differences, and including

elements that identify the differences; and rendering an image of the difference

document using a computer while preserving visual formatting of one of the first and

second documents, with visual features denoting the identified differences. For

example, Aoyama discloses a method for structured document difference string

extraction, where after storing the difference data of comparing structured documents,

the difference data is output in SGML form and displayed using an editor or viewer,

such as a window displaying the difference data in structured form and defining the

altered part by a solid line or otherwise discriminating the altered part by altering the

color or type of the mark representing the structure by a solid line. These discriminated

displays may be highlighted (col 14, lines 5-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Baisley to include outputting difference data in a structured form,

such as an SGML document and discriminating the display by altering the color or type

of the mark as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference

between structured documents by taking the logical meaning and structure of the

structured documents into consideration (Aoyama, Abstract section).

Regarding claims 35, 44 and 53, Baisley suggests wherein said routine identifies new

groups in the second plurality of groups, said difference document includes said new

groups, and said image includes features denoting said new groups. The examiner

characterizes this limitation of 'new groups' as a state where the line has no match in

the other document being compared to (as described in specification, page 1, lines 7-

15). For example, Baisley discloses a compare module that compares two XML

documents where the module provides a result signifying that the documents are

unequal (col 4, lines 46-63). The Examiner believes this is equivalent to the claimed

limitation because if the documents are unequal, that means that they have objects that

the other document does not have, and hence are new.

Regarding claims 36, 45 and 54, Baisley suggests normalizing the first and second

documents by removing characters ignored during rendering and characters that define

format information not relevant to said matching. For example, Baisley discloses

standardizing all XML documents to a common standard semantic graph based format

that the comparison algorithm is capable of processing for comparing a semantic graph

encoded in documents rather than comparing textual content and comparing documents

that ignores differences in internal differences (col 3, lines 5-20).

Regarding claims 38, 47 and 56, Baisley teaches an HTML standard markup language

(col 1, line 25).

Regarding claims 39, 48 and 57, Baisley suggests normalizing both documents, by

detecting a pre-formatting start tag and skipping the pre-formatted text contained

between the start tag and a pre-formatting end tag. For example, Baisley discloses

standardizing all XML documents to a common standard semantic graph based format

that the comparison algorithm is capable of processing for comparing a semantic graph

encoded in documents rather than comparing textual content and comparing documents

that ignores differences in internal differences (col 3, lines 5-20) where the document

contains preformatted star and end tags that are not skipped and not compared (see

tables II and II, col 5, lines 30-67).

Regarding claims 40, 49 and 58, Baisley teaches normalizing the first and second

documents, by removing header tags from the documents. For example, Baisley

discloses comparing documents that ignores differences in internal identifiers (e.g.,

xmi.id values)(col 3, lines 15-20). Table I in col 5 shows a document including header

tags, where these tags will be ignored in order to standardize the XML documents to a

common standard format that the comparison module is capable of comparing, where

the comparison is of the semantics of the document rather than the textual content of

the documents (col 3, lines 5-15). The fact that Baisley discloses removing everything

else other than the semantic objects indicates that headers are also removed from the

documents because headers are not semantics.

Regarding claims 41, 50 and 59, Baisley teaches normalizing the first and second

documents, by removing script references from the documents. For example, Baisley

discloses comparing documents that ignores differences in internal identifiers (e.g.,

xmi.id values)(col 3, lines 15-20). Table I in col 5 shows a document including

metadata tags, where these tags will be ignored in order to standardize the XML

documents to a common standard format that the comparison module is capable of

comparing, where the comparison is of the semantics of the document rather than the

textual content of the documents (col 3, lines 5-15). The fact that Baisley discloses

removing everything else other than the semantic objects indicates that script

references are also removed from the documents because scripts are not semantics.

4-2)   Claims 37, 42, 46, 51, 55 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Baisley (as cited above) and Aoyama (as cited above), further

in view of Blumer et al (US 5890171, issued Mar 30, 1999).

Regarding claims 37, 46 and 55, Baisley in view of Aoyama does not expressly teach,

but Blumer suggests executing a routine using a computer, prior to said matching to

identify differences, to remove characters that comprise intra-document links in the

markup-language, and to convert relative URLs to absolute URLs. For example,

Blumer discloses converting relative URL to an absolute URL, using the effective base

URL of the document (col 11, lines 35-45). The examiner interprets Blumer's teachings

as equivalent to the claimed invention because the examiner characterizes the claimed

intra-documents links as regular links for the purpose of matching to identify differences

in documents, and the removal of links in the claimed invention is to allow for

processing of a base document, which is suggested by the base element of documents

processing in Blumer, coupled with Baisley's disclosure of comparing only semantic

portions of documents rather than comparing textual content (Baisley, col 3, lines 11-13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Baisley in view of Aoyama to include converting relative URLs to absolute URLs, as taught by Blumer, providing the benefit of an improved system for interpreting hypertext links in a document when including the document within another document (Blumer, Title).

Regarding claims 42, 51 and 60, Baisley in view of Aoyama does not expressly teach, but Blumer teaches normalizing the first and second documents, by removing intra-document links from the documents. For example, Blumer discloses converting relative URL to an absolute URL, using the effective base URL of the document (col 11, lines 35-45). The examiner interprets Blumer's teachings as equivalent to the claimed invention because the examiner characterizes the claimed intra-documents links as regular links for the purpose of matching to identify differences in documents, and the removal of links in the claimed invention is to allow for processing of a base document, which is suggested by the base element of documents processing in Blumer. Additionally, Baisley discloses comparing documents that ignores differences in internal identifiers (e.g., xmi.id values)(col 3, lines 15-20). Table I in col 5 shows a document including metadata tags, where these tags will be ignored in order to standardize the XML documents to a common standard format that the comparison module is capable of comparing, where the comparison is of the semantics of the document rather than the textual content of the documents (col 3, lines 5-15). The fact that Baisley discloses

removing everything else other than the semantic objects indicates that script references are also removed from the documents because scripts are not semantics.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Baisley in view of Aoyama to include removing links in order to achieve a base document for comparison by converting relative URLs to absolute URLs, as taught by Blumer, providing the benefit of an improved system for interpreting hypertext links in a document when including the document within another document (Blumer, Title).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 34-60 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. In consideration of the Applicant's arguments on pages 7-11 of the Remarks section, the Examiner introduces rejections under new primary and secondary references, namely Baisley and Aoyama, respectfully. Specifically, Baisley discloses a method for comparing XML documents for identical contents, where a first XML document is parsed to create a graph of it's objects where each object is assigned a unique identification and a second XML document is parsed by a parser to create a graph of its objects where each object is assigned a unique ID. The compare module then compares the documents and provides an output signifying that the documents are equal or unequal (see col 4, lines 46-63). The two documents are compared to see fit hey are semantically identical, that is, there is a one to one correspondence between the objects in the two documents (col 5, lines 10-17). Aoyama discloses a method for structured document difference string extraction, where

after storing the difference data of comparing structured documents, the difference data

is output in SGML form and displayed using an editor or viewer, such as a window

displaying the difference data in structured form and defining the altered part by a solid

line or otherwise discriminating the altered part by altering the   color or type of the mark

representing the structure by a solid line. These discriminated displays may be

highlighted (col 14, lines 5-20). See rejections above for details.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-

4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

65
7/6/6

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER